

LINK:

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>CV 16-01668-BRO (PJWx)</b>	Date	May 4, 2016
Title	<b>VALERIE JACKSON V. RHINO ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY ET AL.</b>		

**Present: The Honorable** **BEVERLY REID O’CONNELL, United States District Judge**

Renee A. Fisher

Not Present

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

Not Present

**Proceedings:** (IN CHAMBERS)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

Plaintiff Valerie Jackson (“Plaintiff”) filed the instant lawsuit against Defendants Rhino Entertainment Company and Sanctuary Records Group Ltd. (“Defendants”) on March 11, 2016, invoking this Court’s federal diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (Dkt. No. 1 (hereinafter, “Compl.”) ¶ 1.)

A federal court must determine its own jurisdiction even where the parties do not raise the issue. *Rains v. Criterion Sys., Inc.*, 80 F.3d 339, 342 (9th Cir. 1996). Because federal courts are of limited jurisdiction, they possess original jurisdiction only as authorized by the Constitution and federal statute. *See Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). Original jurisdiction may be established pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Under § 1332(a), a federal district court has jurisdiction over a civil action in which: (1) there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties; and, (2) the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000.

The Court is satisfied that complete diversity exists. (*See* Compl. ¶ 1.) It is unclear, however, whether Plaintiff satisfies the amount in controversy requirement. In the Complaint, Plaintiff states in a conclusory fashion that the “matter in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum of \$75,000.” (Compl. ¶ 1; *accord* Compl. ¶ 8.) Such a “[c]onclusory allegation[] as to the amount in controversy [is] insufficient.” *Matheson v. Progressive Specialty Ins. Co.*, 319 F.3d 1089, 1090–91 (9th Cir. 2003).

LINK:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	CV 16-01668-BRO (PJWx)	Date	May 4, 2016
Title	VALERIE JACKSON V. RHINO ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY ET AL.		

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause as to why the Court should not dismiss this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff shall file her response by **no later than 4:00 p.m. on Friday, May 6, 2016.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

	:
Initials of Preparer	rf